

REMARKS

A. Status of Claims

Claims 10-27 have been withdrawn. Claim 8 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

B. Summary of Examiner Interview Conducted on November 17, 2005

On November 17, 2005, Applicant's representative, Michael C. Barrett, telephoned Examiner Greene to discuss the present restriction requirement. Applicant thanks the Examiner for courtesies extended during that phone call. Applicant and the Examiner discussed claim 8 and whether a claim amendment would obviate the need for an associated species election. It was agreed that amending claim 8 as shown in the amendment section above would obviate a species election requirement.

C. Response to Restriction and Species Requirements

In response to the restriction requirement which the Examiner imposed, Applicant elects, without traverse, to pursue Group I, which corresponds to claims 1-9.


In response to the first election requirement, Applicant elects, without traverse, embodiments where the fission fragment detectors are not recited as being tunable. Claims 1-3 and 6-9 read on this embodiment. Each of those claims is generic.

With respect to the second species election requirement, Applicant respectfully asserts that the requirement is now moot in view of the amendment to claim 8.

D. Conclusion

Applicant believes that this is a complete response to the Restriction Requirement mailed on October 24, 2005. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at 512/536-3018 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael C. Barrett
Reg. No. 44,523
Attorney for Applicant

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.
2400 One American Center
600 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: 512/536-3018
Facsimile: 512/536-4598

Date: November 18, 2005